

1966

# The Role of the Debate Ballot in the Consistency of Decisions by Inexperienced Debate Judges

Edward Purdy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>

---

## Recommended Citation

Purdy, Edward, "The Role of the Debate Ballot in the Consistency of Decisions by Inexperienced Debate Judges" (1966). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 3227.  
<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/3227>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact [michael.biondo@sdstate.edu](mailto:michael.biondo@sdstate.edu).

2

a powerful tool. The debate ballot is valuable because it gives the debater an evaluation of his efforts and allows him to analyze his weaknesses and attempt to remedy them; if he wins, he should find out why he won so he can continue to use the same methods.<sup>2</sup>

It would seem that the thousands of students participating in debate are justified in expecting the decisions rendered to be based on clearly defined criteria and to be as consistent as possible. The meaning of "consistent" in this project is based on the factor of the uniformity with which decisions are made. If, for example, ten judges all judging the same debate give the same decision, their decision-making process could be considered to be 100 per cent consistent; if seven out of ten judges all give the same decision, the process could be considered 70 per cent consistent.

If the judge in a particular debate has had little or no training in debate, the debate ballot becomes his major source of information for evaluating that debate. It is interesting to note in this respect that one authority points out that to define "skill in debating" as research, reasoning, and speaking is begging the question. He asks how the judge

A research paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Education, Major in Communication, South Dakota State University

<sup>2</sup>Jeffrey Auer and Henry Rybank, *Discussion and Debate* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951), p. 471.



783381  
82599  
S.D.

A RESEARCH PAPER ON THE ROLE  
OF THE DEBATE BALLOT IN THE CONSISTENCY OF  
DECISIONS BY INEXPERIENCED DEBATE JUDGES

JUSTIFICATION  
A RESEARCH PAPER ON THE ROLE

OF THE DEBATE BALLOT IN THE CONSISTENCY OF

important DECISIONS BY INEXPERIENCED DEBATE JUDGES membership in the National Forensic League, which emphasizes debate in its membership qualifications, is 228,640.<sup>1</sup> Some debate tournaments have from 25 to 60 schools represented with as many as 100 four-man teams competing. The Estherville, Iowa, High School had 47 students participating in debate in the 1965-1966 school year, and this figure is comparable to the participation in other schools with strongly supported debate programs.

Judging debates is a necessity in debate competition. Many reasons have been advanced for the desirability of giving decisions in debates, but the following three reasons rather well summarize the arguments:

First, the only reason for debates in real life situations is the necessity for reaching a decision on a problem. School exercises should resemble life situations as nearly as possible. Second, the decision usually stimulates the debaters to greater efforts, both in preparation and performance, than they would otherwise make. The desire to excel is

---

<sup>1</sup> Rostrum, XIII (January, 1966), 19.

THE ROLE OF THE JUDGE IN THE

CONSISTENCY OF DECISIONS

BY INEXPERIENCED DEBATE JUDGES

	PAGE
JUSTIFICATION . . . . .	1
PROBLEM . . . . .	3
PURPOSE . . . . .	5
MATERIALS . . . . .	6
PROCEDURE . . . . .	6
RESULTS . . . . .	17
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	20
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	23
APPENDIX A . . . . .	26
APPENDIX B . . . . .	30

A research paper submitted  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree Master of Education, Major in  
Communication, South Dakota State  
University

1966

A RESEARCH PAPER ON THE ROLE  
OF THE DEBATE BALLOT IN THE CONSISTENCY OF  
DECISIONS BY INEXPERIENCED DEBATE JUDGES

JUSTIFICATION . . . . . 1

PROBLEM . . . . . JUSTIFICATION . . . . . 3

PURPOSE . . . . . 5

Interscholastic debate competition seems to be an important activity in most areas of the country. Membership in the National Forensic League, which emphasizes debate in its membership qualifications, is 228,640.<sup>1</sup> Some debate tournaments have from 25 to 60 schools represented with as many as 100 four-man teams competing. The Estherville, Iowa, High School had 47 students participating in debate in the 1965-1966 school year, and this figure is comparable to the participation in other schools with strongly supported debate programs.

Judging debates is a necessity in debate competition. Many reasons have been advanced for the desirability of giving decisions in debates, but the following three reasons rather well summarize the arguments:

First, the only reason for debates in real life situations is the necessity for reaching a decision on a problem. School exercises should resemble life situations as nearly as possible. Second, the decision usually stimulates the debaters to greater efforts, both in preparation and performance, than they would otherwise make. The desire to excell is

---

<sup>1</sup>Rostrum, XXXX (January, 1966), 19.

a powerful motivating force. Third, the decision is valuable because it gives the debater an evaluation of his efforts. If he loses, he should analyze his weaknesses and attempt to remedy them; if he wins, he should find out the reasons for his success so he can continue to use the same methods.<sup>2</sup>

It would seem that the thousands of students participating in debate are justified in expecting the decisions of course, could be totally different for each judge. It rendered to be based on clearly defined criteria and to be appears, then, that one of the factors is the consistency as consistent as possible. The meaning of "consistent" in of a decision in a debate judged by inexperienced judges is this project is based on the factor of the uniformity with the measuring instrument--the debate ballot. which decisions are made. If, for example, ten judges all judging the same debate give the same decision, their quantity of participation in debate and the necessity for decision-making process could be considered to be 100 per cent consistent; if seven out of ten judges all give the same used in debate competition result in consistent evaluations. decision, the process could be considered 70 per cent consistent. The study that was undertaken attempted to obtain information about this characteristic of debate ballots.

If the judge in a particular debate has had little or no training in debate, the debate ballot becomes his major source of information for evaluating that debate. It is interesting to note in this respect that one authority points out that to define "skill in debating" as research, reasoning, and speaking is begging the question. He asks how the judge is to determine the comparative excellence of the teams in ideal, of course, to have highly qualified judges always. these qualities and he states that he knows of no two experts

---

<sup>2</sup>Jeffery Auer and Henry Ewbank, Discussion and Debate (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951), p. 471.

who accept the same set of standards.<sup>3</sup> If this is the case with experts, it appears that without a rather detailed, well-structured ballot the decision in a debate judged by inexperienced people could be based upon each judge's conception or misconception of criteria for a decision. This criteria, of course, could be totally different for each judge. It appears, then, that one of the factors in the consistency of a decision in a debate judged by inexperienced judges is the measuring instrument--the debate ballot.

It would seem important, therefore, in view of the quantity of participation in debate and the necessity for consistent decisions by inexperienced judges, that ballots used in debate competition result in consistent evaluations. The study that was undertaken attempted to obtain information about this characteristic of debate ballots.

#### PROBLEM

Debate judging is constantly and probably justifiably being criticized. These criticisms dwell mainly on the lack of qualified judges and on the wide differences of opinions as to who the winner in a debate really is. It would be ideal, of course, to have highly qualified judges always.

---

<sup>3</sup>Hugh Wells, "Judging Debates," Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, III (April, 1917), 336.



Holcomb, for example, has submitted the following qualifications for a critic-judge. He believes such a person should be an impartial individual who knows debate theory and practice thoroughly, who has analytical ability, and who has had considerable experience in debate work.<sup>4</sup> At the risk of understating the fact, it is somewhat difficult to obtain such super-judges. Many times a debate director must rely on people with little or no debate training for judges. For example, Estherville High School in several tournaments this year fielded 11 four-man teams, and had to provide a judge for each team. The difficulty in securing that many experienced and trained judges is evident.

The importance of the problem of a lack of consistency of decision is well known to debate coaches. Speech literature also contains examples of this difficulty. As stated in the Speech Teacher, for example, "it is not unusual for a team to be rated inferior and superior on the same day and even in the same debate tournament."<sup>5</sup> At one debate tournament, a Penn State Women's team was rated in five successive rounds as below average, adequate, good, very

---

<sup>4</sup>Martin Holcomb, "The Critic Judge System," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIX (April, 1933), 31.

<sup>5</sup>Carl Robuck, "The Score of the Game," Speech Teacher, XIV (January, 1953), 31.

good, and superior.<sup>6</sup> Their debating skill probably did not actually vary to such a marked degree. In the Dartmouth Tournament one year, a team was rated by five different judges as being in five different categories, ranging from "poor" to "superior," with ratings of 27, 49, 57, 76, and 89 points out of a possible 100 points.<sup>7</sup>

The latter of the two problems mentioned, then, seemed to be more relevant and more amenable to solution. The problem, on the basis of this analysis, was a lack of consistency in determining the winner in a debate when judging is done by inexperienced persons.

#### PURPOSE

The aim of this project was to investigate the role of the debate ballot in the consistency of decisions. Two areas of inquiry were pursued: (1) Is there a difference in the consistency with which the three debate ballots to be tested determine the outcome of a debate? (The consistency for a group of judges was calculated in terms of the percentage of judges giving the decision to the same team.)

The first ballot was designed to focus the judge's  
 attention.<sup>6</sup> Arthur Kruger, "The Debate Judge as a Critical Thinker," Today's Speech, V (January, 1957), 17.

<sup>7</sup>Arthur Kruger, Modern Debate (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), p. 361.

(2) If there is a difference in the consistency of decision, which of the ballots provides the greatest consistency?

### MATERIALS

Debate texts, professional journals, and debate ballots used at various schools in the area were examined to gain information for constructing the ballots to be used in the project. The ballots that were constructed were duplicated and distributed to the appropriate judging groups. (See Procedure.) Directions and materials required by the judging groups were written, duplicated, and given to each prospective judge. These materials included directions for judging, assignment sheet for being a student judge, and the sequence of speeches in a debate.

### PROCEDURE

Four different debate ballots were constructed. These were based on information gained through research in text materials, professional journals, and the writer's experience and ideas.

The first ballot was designed to focus the judge's attention on the basic issues of the debate. It was thus rather brief, concentrating on from three to six points of clash. The basis of the ballot was that the judge would be



able to structure his thoughts in the debate along the lines directed by this ballot and would then be listening only for arguments pertaining to the central issues. Emphasis was placed on the judge listening to only what is related to the main issues in the debate. Emphasis was also placed on paying attention to what is actually said, not what could have been said. The judge might know that one team could have taken a much stronger position than the comparative weak position it did take. However, he must never require the students to debate him; rather they must debate the opposing team. He must never ask, "Could I refute a particular argument?" but rather, "Did the opposing team refute that argument?" "He does not ask whether a team's position was weak or strong in relation to the ideal position, but whether the team's position was weaker or stronger than that of its opponents."<sup>8</sup> No matter what techniques were used by the debaters, then, the judge's thoughts should have pertained to whether, on the basis of what was said, he agreed or disagreed with each of the statements on the ballot. (See Appendix B.)

One advantage of this ballot might have been that it directed the judge's attention and his decision making

---

<sup>8</sup>Austin Freely, Argumentation and Debate (San Francisco: Wadsworth Company, 1961), p. 283.

<sup>10</sup>James Holt, How to Judge Speech Contests (Portland: Platform Publishing Company, 1938), p. 104.

process only to the basic points of clash in each debate. He was then thinking in terms of the result of the conflicts and not in terms of means to these results such as organization and delivery. Another possible advantage could have been that points of conflict were the same in any debate and for any judge, thus perhaps providing for the consistency that was desired.

Ballots "B" and "C" differed significantly from ballot "A" in that they were designed to focus the attention of the judge on debater characteristics as a means of evaluating the debate. Texts and professional journals listed numerous and sometimes differing lists of what were the basic elements in a debate. Most sources stated that the judge should develop a set of criteria, that he should "determine the reasons for effectiveness, or lack of it, on each side."<sup>9</sup>

Examples of criteria that were listed in various sources might be helpful to understand the similarities and differences in approach. Holn contends that the factors to consider in judging a debate include the following: "Analysis of the proposition, preponderance of evidence, quality of evidence, skill in reasoning, skill in refutation and effectiveness of delivery."<sup>10</sup> Braden and Brandenburg expand the

---

<sup>9</sup>George Pattee, Practical Argumentation (New York: Century Company, 1915), p. 277.

<sup>10</sup>James Holn, How to Judge Speech Contests (Portland: Platform Publishing Company, 1938), p. 104.

list of criteria and attempt to explain what they mean by the several terms. This, by the way, was one of the few sources that attempted to define the debater characteristics with which they believed a debate should be judged. According to this source, the criteria for judging can be reduced to eight:

1. Analysis--An attempt of the debater to understand the proposition, to define the terms, to partition the arguments and subpoints and to understand the vital issues of the problem.

2. Organization--The student's attempt to order his points for clear oral presentation.

3. Argument and supporting facts--The use of sufficient, reliable proof and a reserve of information.

4. Refutation--Adapting arguments to those of the opposition.

5. Language--Clear, appropriate language adapted to the listeners.

6. Delivery--Bodily action, voice control, pronunciation and voice quality.

7. Attitudes--Absence of sarcasm and noncooperativeness.

8. Overall effectiveness--The total persuasive impression given by the debate.<sup>11</sup>

As may be seen from examining these definitions, they seem to be vague and general and unsuited for use by inexperienced debate judges. Therefore, the definitions of the

judges to concentrate his attention on the basic skills in-

<sup>11</sup>Waldo Braden and Earnest Brandenburg, Oral Decision-Making (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), p. 520.

characteristics finally adopted for the ballots were based on the writer's judgment of what the inexperienced judge could understand, consistent with the definition being a valid description of the characteristic.

The characteristics and their definitions that were finally developed for ballot "B" included organization, reasoning, evidence, refutation, and delivery. (See Appendix B.) The judge was to circle the team he felt did the better job of debating in relation to each of the characteristics. Since the aim of the ballots in this project was to structure the judge's thinking in the debate, and therefore his basis for arriving at a decision, into a small number of concretely defined criteria, the number of characteristics listed was limited to these five main items. The definition of these items was made specific and quite brief. The brevity was more difficult to attain than was the lengthy explanations that were developed at first. It is hoped, however, that this form improved the effectiveness of the ballot when used by novice judges.

A possible advantage of this ballot could have been that it reduced the total number of factors the novice judge must consider in his decision to five. This allowed the judge to concentrate his attention on the basic skills involved in debate. As these factors should have been the same most time consuming and perhaps the most difficult



for each judge, the consistency with which a debate was evaluated should have improved.

Ballot "C" was similar to ballot "B" in that it concentrated the judge's attention on five debater characteristics as a basis for decision. It had two differences, however, which were designed to change the way in which it was used. First, the judge was required to rate each speaker in the debate, not the team as a whole. Second, a numerical rating scale was used to evaluate the speakers and to calculate the winner. (See Appendix B.)

An advantage of this ballot could have been that the process of translating the performance of each debater into mathematical terms objectified the judging process. If this is so, the use of this ballot aids in attaining consistency of decision.

Ballot "D" was the control ballot. The judge was only to circle the team that he thought won the debate. No method of arriving at the decision was given so each judge was free to choose his own method of determining the winner. (See Appendix B.)

Four groups of inexperienced debate judges were then formed. These judges were all high school students in at least their sophomore year. None of the judges selected had debated or had seen an interscholastic debate contest. The most time consuming and perhaps the most difficult

organizational aspect of the project was securing these student judges. In the prospectus it was stated that five judges would be the minimal number assigned to each group. However, for the sake of a more reliable measure of the performance of the debate ballots an attempt was made to secure as many student judges as possible. Detailed ballots were to come. In order to acquire an adequate number of judges, a special assignment was given to each student in all the speech, English, and social studies classes. (See Appendix A.) This assignment required that the student participate in the judging project or, as an alternative, that he do a related assignment. It happened that the related assignment required more work than the judging assignment. A large amount of arm twisting was required to get some teachers to agree to this, but it was emphasized that all organization and correcting would be done by the writer, and finally every teacher consented to make the judging project a major assignment. Due in large part to the required nature of the judging project, 171 judges were obtained. This resulted in a minimum of 42 judges being assigned to each of the four judging groups. format of a debate. (See Appendix A.) It was necessary to try was made at having the judges use the ballots with no prior information being given. As this was a dismal failure, it seemed certain that the student judges would need some basic information about using the ballots and about the

procedure they would follow on the day of the tournament. Therefore, two informational meetings were scheduled--one after school and one in the evening. A student could come to either meeting, thus reducing the many conflicts that would have arisen from athletics, jobs, and other activities. Only those judges using the three detailed ballots were to come to these meetings. *allow for high school students, and a list of*

The first subject to be covered at these meetings was the use of the debate ballots. The criteria on the ballots was explained and any questions about the criteria were answered. A demonstration was given on how to fill out the ballot on a large sample copy of each ballot. The explanation of each of the three ballots took only about 15 minutes. It appeared that it would be feasible, then, to explain the ballots to a group of inexperienced judges in a general meeting before a debate tournament. The need to explain briefly the workings of the ballot, therefore, would not seem to significantly hinder their use in practical tournament situations. *etc designed to increase consistency of decision.*

The second area of explanation was a brief discussion of the format of a debate. (See Appendix A.) It was necessary to distribute a paper with the time sequences so that the student judges could follow the debate. Without a knowledge of debate format, a large percentage of the judges would

have been unable to determine what speaker they were listening to." and "3" and the ballots lettered "A," "B," and "C."

Detailed directions were then given to the judges concerning what they were to do on the day of the debate tournament. (See Appendix A.) This seemed to be the most difficult part of the project for the students. Directions are at times hard to follow for high school students, and a list of eleven steps that must be followed was somewhat unnerving for them. The content of the direction sheet is stated in Appendix A, so the specific directions that were given will not be repeated here.

Each group of judges was assigned to judge three debates. The group that was not given prior information, the control group, used the ballot upon which they only circled "affirmative" or "negative" to designate the winner. This group used this ballot for all three debates. The other three groups of judges had a different ballot assigned each debate. These ballots were the experimental ballots designed to increase consistency of decision. The ballot assignments thus rotated from group to group, with each group having used all three ballots by the third round. This was done so that the degree of consistency with which a ballot determined a decision was not directly related to the group that used that ballot, but to the factors contained in



the ballot itself. The groups, therefore, were numbered "1," "2," and "3" and the ballots lettered "A," "B," and "C."

The schedule was set up as follows:

GROUP	BALLOT IDENTIFICATION		
	<u>Round 1</u>	<u>Round 2</u>	<u>Round 3</u>
1	A	B	C
2	B	C	A
3	C	A	B

The control ballot was labeled "D" and, as has been explained, the judging group used this ballot all three rounds.

In order to implement this schedule, the following procedure was used: The three ballots for each judge were arranged in the order that they were to be used. One group had the ballots in the order "ABC," the next in the order "BCA," and the last in the order "CAB." The number of the round in which the ballot was to be used was written on the front of every ballot. Therefore, there were three groups of ballots with approximately 42 three-ballot piles in each group. For example, for the 42 people in group "1," the ballots were clipped with ballot "A" for round 1, "B" for round 2, and "C" for round 3. Group 2 had their ballots clipped in the order of ballot "B" round 1, "C" round 2, and "A" round 3. Group 3 had ballot "C" round 1, ballot "A" round 2, and ballot "B" round 3.

ballot " As the judges arrived on the day of the tournament, each was assigned to a group and given the three ballots clipped in the appropriate order. The members of the control group were given their three identical ballots. This procedure seemed to gain the desired end of having each group use a different ballot each round so that it would be the ballot rather than the judging group for which consistency would be measured.

As is clear from the schedule, the four groups of judges judged the same debate round one, and then moved as a group to judge each succeeding round. Thus, the ballots for round one all measured the same debate, as did the ballots for round two and round three.

Upon the completion of each debate, all the student judges brought their completed ballots for that debate to the central office where there were four containers marked "A," "B," "C," and "D" respectively. Each judge placed his ballot for the debate in the box that corresponded to the letter of the ballot that he used that round. By this method the ballots were automatically arranged according to types.

After all ballots for a round had been returned, they were placed in envelopes labeled as to ballot letter and round. Therefore, at the end of the three rounds of debate, there were twelve envelopes with the following designations:

ballot "A" round 1, "B" round 1, "C" round 1, and "D" round 1; ballot "A" round 2, "B" round 2, "C" round 2, and "D" round 2; ballot "A" round 3, "B" round 3, "C" round 3, and "D" round 3. Upon collection and classification of all completed ballots in this manner, the results were ready to be tabulated.

### RESULTS

The purpose of this project was to construct three experimental debate ballots and then to determine which of these was the most consistent in measuring the outcome of debates. As has been explained, the index of measuring this consistency was the percentage of judges giving the winning team their decision.

On this basis, ballot "C" rendered the most consistency of decision throughout the three debates. Ballot "A" provided the next most consistent decisions, with ballot "B" being third and ballot "D" providing the least amount of consistency. On page 18 is a table providing both the raw scores and percentage indexes of consistency.

As can be seen from the table, ballot "C" provided an average consistency of decision of 80.9 per cent. This was quite high when compared to the other ballots, especially "B" and "D". Therefore, on the basis of the results obtained,

TABLE I

Ballot	Round One			Round Two			Round Three			Average Per Cent for Each Ballot
	Winner	Loser	Per Cent	Winner	Loser	Per Cent	Winner	Loser	Per Cent	
A	27	11	71.1	25	15	62.5	32	9	80.0	71.2
B	27	15	64.3	23	15	60.5	33	7	82.5	69.1
C	34	11	75.5	29	11	72.5	35	2	94.6	80.9
D	20	20	50.0	27	16	65.1	33	9	78.6	64.6
Average per cent for each round			65.2			65.1			83.9	

ballot "C" seemed to provide the greatest consistency of decision.

Although it was not specifically in the realm of this project to develop explanations as to why the consistency of one ballot was greater than that of another, some possible reasons might be advanced. As stated in "Procedure," the strength of ballot "C" could well be that it required a definite set of criteria to be applied to each speaker in the debate, thus helping to objectify the judging process. Also,

each criterion was given a numerical quality rating from 1-15 which also could have had an objectifying effect.

Ballot "A", although second highest in percentage of consistency, suffered from a difference of opinion on the part of the judges as to what the specific contentions in each debate were. It may be that the contentions were not made clear by the debaters or that the judges did not understand the meaning of the term. At any rate, in all three debates, quite a variance of contentions was listed by the student judges, making the use of this type of ballot questionable.

Ballot "B" had the lowest percentage of consistency of the three experimental ballots. This might be attributed to the fact that the rating given on the criteria was given as a team average rather than as individual ratings. It may have been too difficult to average the abilities of the two speakers in each characteristic without some definite means to do so appearing on the ballot.

In the opinion of the writer one of the most significant outcomes of the project was that the ballot on which there were no criteria given did poorly. As can be seen from the table, ballot "D" provided a consistency of only 64.6 per cent compared to an average of 73.7 per cent for the three experimental ballots and 80.9 per cent for ballot "C".



This seems to indicate that the inclusion of definite criteria on debate ballots used by inexperienced judges is a worthwhile measure to improve the consistency of decisions.

The table also demonstrates that the amount of consistency of decision also depends to some extent on the particular debate being judged. For example, round one and round two were both rather close, no matter with which ballot they were being evaluated. Round three, on the other hand, was a one-sided debate, with an average of 83.9 per cent of all judges agreeing upon the winner. The interesting aspect of this, however, is that in all debates--whether close or an obvious defeat--ballot "C" was consistent in being more consistent. In the third round, for example, it provided 94.6 per cent agreement compared to the average of 83.9 per cent. It appears from this that while the debate itself affects consistency of decisions by inexperienced judges, the debate ballot is a factor in increasing consistency.

#### CONCLUSIONS

1. The consistency with which a decision is given in a debate judged by inexperienced judges increases when the ballot used contains criteria which are to be used to evaluate the debate.

2. A greater degree of consistency can be obtained when the ballot contains criteria relating to debater

characteristics such as refutation, and when the evaluation of these characteristics is made in numerical terms--that is, the speaker is rated from 1-15 on each characteristic.

3. More study is needed, perhaps on the thesis level, to verify the results of this study and to expand the scope and depth of the analysis. The direction of further study might emphasize a more precise statistical measure of consistency. Further study might also deal with finding a method to insure that the judges always use the criteria listed on the ballot. A study could be conducted to determine if the number of units in a numerical rating scale of debater characteristics makes a difference in consistency. For example, does a ballot need a rating scale of from 1-15 on refutation, organization, et cetera, to be effective? Would 1-5 be just as good or would 1-100 increase consistency?

From a procedural standpoint, some attention should be given in any future studies to insuring that the ballots do not emphasize by underlining or frequency of mention either the affirmative or negative team. In the present study this happened twice. The first instance occurred in ballot "A" with the underlining of the phrase "as the first affirmative speaker gives them." (See Appendix B.) This phrase might be changed to "as the first speaker in the debate gives them." The frequency of mention of the affirmative team in this ballot was necessary because of the emphasis upon the

contentions as the focal point of decision. It should be emphasized on this ballot that the judge's duty is to first take a neutral position on the contentions and then listen to the debate to determine later if he agrees or disagrees with them. On ballot "C" the underlining of "total affirmative team score" was inadvertent and should not be done on future ballots of this type. (See Appendix B.) It is difficult to determine if the emphasis on the affirmative resulted in a bias for this side. The group decision for all ballots was "affirmative" rounds one and three but was "negative" round two. This was the same as the professional judge's decision for these rounds so perhaps the bias, if any, was not significant. In order to help insure objectivity, however, the above mentioned changes should be adopted on the ballots in question.

More detailed study is needed in this area. It is also important that results of these studies be implemented in interscholastic debate competition. In this way the present state of debate judging can be improved.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alden, Raymond. The Art of Debate. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1908.
- Auer, Jeffery and Ewbank, Henry. Discussion and Debate. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.
- Braden, Waldo and Bradenbourg, Earnest. Oral Decision Making. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934.
- Courtney, Luther and Cogg, Glenn. Practical Debating. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1949.
- Foster, William. Argumentation and Debating. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1917.
- Fox, Andrew. Modern Debating. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1932.
- Freely, Austin. Argumentation and Debate. San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing **BIBLIOGRAPHY** 51.
- Gibson, Harold and Sheppard, Victor. Practical High School Debating. Minneapolis: The Northwestern Press, 1934.
- Helcomb, Martin. "The Critic Judge System," Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, XIX (April, 1933), 31.
- Helm, James. How to Judge Speech Contests. Portland: Platform News Publishing Company, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Philosophy of Judging Debate," The Southern Speech Bulletin, V (January, 1940), 12.
- Kruger, Arthur. "The Debate Judge as a Critical Thinker," Today's Speech, V (January, 1937), 17.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Modern Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1940.
- Lahman, Carroll. Debate Coaching. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1930.
- Murphy, James and Ericson, Jon. The Debater's Guide. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1961.

23

Musgrove, George. COMP. BIBLIOGRAPHY. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1957.

Alden, Raymond. The Art of Debate. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1900.

Auer, Jeffery and Ewbank, Henry. Discussion and Debate. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.

Braden, Waldo and Brandenburg, Earnest. Oral Decision Making. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Courtney, Luther and Capp, Glenn. Practical Debating. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1949.

Shurter, Edwin. How to Debate. New York: Harper and Foster, William. Argumentation and Debating. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1917.

Summers, Harrison. Contests Debating. New York: H. W. Fox, Andrew. Modern Debating. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1932.

Freely, Austin. Argumentation and Debate. San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1961.

Wells, Hugh. Judging Debates. Quarterly Journal of Public Gibson, Harold and Sheppard, Victor. Practical High School Debating. Minneapolis: The Northwestern Press, 1934.

Holcomb, Martin. "The Critic Judge System," Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, XIX (April, 1933), 31.

Holn, James. How to Judge Speech Contests. Portland: Platform News Publishing Company, 1938.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Philosophy of Judging Debate," The Southern Speech Bulletin, V (January, 1940), 12.

Kruger, Arthur. "The Debate Judge as a Critical Thinker," Today's Speech, V (January, 1957), 17.

\_\_\_\_\_. Modern Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Lahman, Carroll. Debate Coaching. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1930.

Murphy, James and Ericson, Jon. The Debater's Guide. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1961.

Musgrove, George. Competitive Debate. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1957.

Pattee, George. Practical Argumentation. New York: The Century Company, 1915.

Phelps, Edith. Debater's Manual. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1922.

Robuck, Carl. "The Score of the Game," Speech Teacher, XIV (January, 1953), 31.

Rostrum, XXXX (January, 1966), 19.

Shurter, Edwin. How to Debate. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1917.

Summers, Harrison. Contest Debating. New York: H. W. Wilson and Company, 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_. How to Debate. New York: H. W. Wilson and Company, 1950.

Wells, Hugh. "Judging Debates," Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, III (December, 1917), 336.

## LABOR PROBLEM ASSIGNMENT

Alternative 1

Observe three debates on labor problems Saturday, November 20. You will have to be at the high school at 11:30 and will observe until 3:15 or 3:30. During each debate you will fill out sheets relating to that debate. Directions on how to fill out these sheets will be given Thursday, November 18 at 3:45 and 7:00 p.m. in the study hall--you may come to either meeting.

Alternative 2

Write an eight page research paper establishing a case for or against the right to strike. Support your position by documented evidence and by your own reasoning. The paper should include at least three basic reasons why you are for (or against) the right to strike. Some discussion of compulsory arbitration should **APPENDIX A**ed in this paper.

**Student Judge Direction Sheets**

## LABOR PROBLEMS ASSIGNMENT

Alternative 1

Observe three debates on labor problems Saturday, November 20. You will have to be at the high school at 11:30 and will observe until 3:15 or 3:30. During each debate you will fill out sheets relating to that debate. Directions on how to fill out these sheets will be given Thursday, November 18 at 3:45 and 7:00 p.m. in the study hall-- you may come to either meeting.

Alternative 2

Write an eight page research paper establishing a case for or against the right to strike. Support your position by documented evidence and by your own reasoning. The paper should include at least three basic reasons why you are for (or against) the right to strike. Some discussion of compulsory arbitration should be included in this paper.

**STUDENT JUDGES:** Below is listed the sequence of speeches for the debates you will judge. Know this sequence so that you may more efficiently follow the course of the debate.

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE--8 minutes** (He is cross-examined by the second negative speaker.)

**FIRST NEGATIVE--8 minutes** (He is cross-examined by the first affirmative speaker.)

**SECOND AFFIRMATIVE--8 minutes** (He is cross-examined by the first negative speaker.)

**SECOND NEGATIVE--8 minutes** (He is cross-examined by the second affirmative speaker.)

**FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL--4 minutes**

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL--4 minutes**

**SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL--4 minutes**

**SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL--4 minutes**



## DIRECTION SHEET FOR STUDENT DEBATE JUDGES

1. Be at the high school office no later than 11:30 a.m., Saturday, November 20.
2. Have something to write on--a clipboard, large magazine, or notebook.
3. Write your name under the class you are doing this for on the paper posted in the office.
4. The first round you will judge in the little theater, the second in the study hall, and the third in the gym.
- \* 5. Use the ballot numbered "1" in round 1, the ballot numbered "2" in round 2, and the ballot numbered "3" in round 3! The ballots are clipped in the order that you are to use them; do not change this order. The order will be different for different people so be sure to use ballot 1 round 1, ballot 2 round 2, and ballot 3 round 3.
6. Be very sure to read the ballots carefully and do exactly what they direct you to do. Follow the directions on the ballot to the letter. Your grade will depend upon how well you read and follow these directions.
7. Put your name and the class you are doing this for on each ballot.
8. Be sure to fill out each ballot in full; do everything the ballot tells you to do.
9. Do not be afraid to rate a speaker or a team very high or very low if they deserve the rating.
10. Do not confer with anybody during or after a debate as to how to fill out the ballot for that debate. The decision you make must be yours and yours alone, so don't talk with anybody during or after the debate about what decision they make.
11. After each round bring the ballot for that round to the office and put it in the box that has the letter of that ballot on it.

## Directions - Ballot A

In the spaces provided below write the affirmative contentions as the first affirmative speaker gives them. This speaker will give his contentions at the beginning of his speech. It is important that you write these down immediately in the spaces provided. If you do not get all the contentions written at first, wait until the speaker explains them and then write them down. Do not write anything the speaker might mention about the affirmative plan.

After writing the affirmative contentions you will notice you have a series of statements on the ballot; some are the contentions you have written. Some are statements already on the ballot that pertain to the affirmative plan.

Your job as judge in this debate is to listen carefully to the debaters to determine if what they say makes you want to agree or disagree with each statement written on the ballot. At the end of the debate if you agree with a statement circle the word "agree," if you disagree circle the word "disagree." If you have more "agrees" than "disagrees" circled, write affirmative as the winner. If you have more "disagrees" than "agrees" circled write negative as the winner. If you have an equal number of "agrees" and "disagrees" circled, also write negative as the winner.

## APPENDIX B

Be objective, do not let your opinions on this subject influence the decisions you make. Do not ask, "Could I refute or attack that argument?" but rather ask "Did I refute that argument?" In other words, base your decisions on the statements only on what is said in this particular debate.

### Judge's Ballots

1. By number "1" write the first affirmative contention.

I    agree    disagree    with this statement.

2. By number "2" write the second affirmative contention (if one is presented).

I    agree    disagree    with this statement.

3. By number "3" write the third affirmative contention (if one is presented).

I    agree    disagree    with this statement.

4. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WOULD SOLVE THE NEED OR PROBLEM THAT WAS OUTLINED.

I    agree    disagree    with this statement.



### Directions - Ballot A

In the spaces provided below write the affirmative contentions as the first affirmative speaker gives them. This speaker will preview his contentions at the beginning of his speech. It is important that you write these down immediately in the spaces provided. If you do not get all the contentions written at first, wait until the speaker explains them and then write them down. Do not write anything the speaker might mention about the affirmative plan.

After writing the affirmative contentions you will notice you have a series of statements on the ballot; some are the contentions you have written, some are statements already on the ballot that pertain to the affirmative plan.

Your job as judge in this debate is to listen carefully to the debaters to determine if what they say makes you agree or disagree with each statement written on the ballot. At the end of the debate if you agree with a statement circle the word "agree," if you disagree circle the word "disagree." If you have more "agrees" than "disagrees" circled, write affirmative as the winner. If you have more "disagrees" than "agrees" circled write negative as the winner. If you have an equal number of "agrees" and "disagrees" circled, also write negative as the winner.

Be objective, do not let your opinions on this subject influence the decisions you make. Do not ask, "Could I refute or attack that argument?" but rather ask "Did the opposing team refute that argument?" In other words, base your decisions on the statements only on what is said in this particular debate.

1. By number "1" write the first affirmative contention.

I    agree       disagree    with this statement.

2. By number "2" write the second affirmative contention (if one is presented).

I    agree       disagree    with this statement.

3. By number "3" write the third affirmative contention (if one is presented).

I    agree       disagree    with this statement.

4. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WOULD SOLVE THE NEED OR PROBLEM THAT WAS OUTLINED.

I    agree       disagree    with this statement.

# 5. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WOULD HAVE NO SEVERE PROBLEMS OF OPERATION, SUCH AS ENFORCEMENT, COST, OR ADMINISTRATION.

On the ballot below are listed the basic characteristics of debaters and their vital definitions. Please read these definitions before the debate and, if needed, re-read them during the debate.

During the debate listen to decide which team is more skilled in each of the characteristics listed. You will have to weigh the performance of each member of the team. For example if one speaker on a team is excellent in ORGANIZATION but his partner is poor, the team as a whole will be considered as average. Use only the factors listed and their definitions, allow nothing else to influence your decision.

Number of "agrees" circled \_\_\_\_\_

At the end of the debate circle the team (affirmative or negative) which did the better job in each characteristic listed on the ballot. Total the number of times you circled affirmative and put it in the blank by "affirmative total." Total the number of times you circled negative and put it by "negative total." Write the side that has the highest total in the blank marked "winner."

Number of "disagrees" circled \_\_\_\_\_

**ORGANIZATION** - Therefore, the winner in this debate have clearer statements of the points they are trying to make. Ask yourself at the beginning of the speech which team better explains what it is going to is the, then gives the winner team. a point by point sequence, and then summarizes what was said.

"The team that did the better job in this characteristic is the affirmative negative team." (Circle one.)

**REASONING** - Decide which team did a better job of supporting its main contentions and main sub-contentions with examples, facts and statistics. Decide which team better used logic to build up its case and to destroy its opponents' case.

"The team that did the better job in this characteristic is the affirmative negative team." (Circle one.)

**EVIDENCE** - Decide which team made the better use of evidence by considering the following points: Is enough evidence used? Are the sources of the evidence stated? Are a variety of sources used? Are the sources competent? Does the evidence used directly support the point that is being made?

"The team that did the better job in this characteristic is the affirmative negative team." (Circle one.)

**REFUTATION** - Decide which team did the better job of refutation by considering the following points: Is what is to be refuted stated

**Directions - Ballot B**

On the ballot below are listed five basic characteristics of debaters and their brief definitions. Please read these definitions before the debate and, if needed, re-read them during the debate.

During the debate listen to decide which team is more skilled in each of the characteristics listed. You will have to weigh the performance of each member of the team. For example if one speaker on a team is excellent in ORGANIZATION but his partner is poor, the team as a whole would probably be considered as average. Use only the factors listed and their definitions, allow nothing else to influence your decision.

At the end of the debate circle the team (affirmative or negative) which you think--- based on the definitions--- did the better job in each characteristic listed on the ballot. Total the number of times you circled affirmative and put it in the blank by "affirmative total." Total the number of times you circled negative and put it by "negative total." Write the side that has the highest total in the blank marked "winner."

**ORGANIZATION** - Decide whether the affirmative or the negative have clearer statements of the points they are trying to make. Ask yourself at the beginning of the speech which team better explains what it is going to present, then gives the material in a point by point sequence, and then summarizes what was said.

"The team that did the better job in this characteristic is the affirmative      negative team." (Circle one.)

**REASONING** - Decide which team did a better job of supporting its main contentions and main sub-contentions with examples, facts and statistics. Decide which team better uses logic to build up its case and to destroy its opponents' case.

"The team that did the better job in this characteristic is the affirmative      negative team." (Circle one.)

**EVIDENCE** - Decide which team made the better use of evidence by considering the following points: Is enough evidence used? Are the sources of the evidence stated? Are a variety of sources used? Are the sources competent? Does the evidence used directly support the point that is being made?

"The team that did the better job in this characteristic is the affirmative      negative team." (Circle one.)

**REFUTATION** - Decide which team did the better job of refutation by considering the following points: Is what is to be refuted stated

clearly? Are the exact statements of the other team repeated? Does the refutation directly attack main contentions and major sub-points? Is the significance of the attack on the opponents' case pointed out?

"The team that did the better job in this characteristic is the affirmative negative team." (Circle one.)

**DELIVERY** - Decide which team had the better delivery by considering the following points: Do the speakers speak distinctly and have pleasant voices? Does the rate of speaking allow ease of comprehension? Do the speakers have direct eye contact with the audience? Do the speakers seem to be speaking extemporaneously or just reading note cards? Do the speakers appear poised and in control of the situation?

"The team that did the better job in this characteristic is the affirmative negative team." (Circle one.)

A. **ORGANIZATION** - Decide if the speaker has a clear statement of the points he is trying to make. Ask yourself if he explains at the beginning of his speech what he is going to present, then gives the material in a point by point sequence, and then summarizes what he said.

B. **REASONING** - Decide how well the speaker supports his main contentions and sub-points with examples, facts, and statistics. Decide how well the speaker uses logic to build up his speech and to destroy what his opponents said.

C. **EVIDENCE** - Decide how well the speaker uses evidence by considering the following points: Is enough evidence used? Are the sources of the evidence stated? Are a variety of sources used? Are the sources competent? Does the evidence used directly support the point that is being made?

D. **REFUTATION** - Decide how skilled the speaker is in refutation by considering the following points: Is what is to be refuted stated clearly? Are the exact statements of the other team repeated? Does the refutation directly attack main contentions and main sub-points? Is the significance of the attack on the opponents' case pointed out?

E. **DELIVERY** - Decide how skilled the speaker is in delivery by considering the following points: Does the speaker speak distinctly and have a pleasant voice? Does the rate of speaking allow ease of comprehension? Does the speaker have direct eye contact with the audience? Does the speaker seem to be speaking extemporaneously or just reading note cards? Does the speaker appear poised and in control of the situation?

**WINNER**

(Turn the page for the score sheet.)



### Directions - Ballot C

In the spaces that appear below rate each speaker in the debate from 1 to 15 on each of the five characteristics listed. The numbers represent in ascending order the skill of the debater in the characteristics. In other words a "1" rating is poor, a "7" or "8" is average and a "15" is superior. You have, therefore, a choice of rating from a "1" through "15," depending upon how well you think the debater did in the characteristic. Check the box that corresponds to the rating you give the speaker in each characteristic.

At the end of the debate add the scores you have checked for each team. Put the total affirmative team score (all the ratings) in the blank marked "total affirmative team score." Put the total negative team score in the blank marked "total negative team score." Write the side that has the highest total in the blank marked "winner."

Below are brief definitions of the five characteristics you are to rate. Please read these carefully, and if needed, re-read them during the debate. Use only these factors and their definitions to judge this debate.

A. ORGANIZATION - Decide if the speaker has a clear statement of the points he is trying to make. Ask yourself if he explains at the beginning of his speech what he is going to present, then gives the material in a point by point sequence, and then summarizes what he said.

B. REASONING - Decide how well the speaker supports his main contentions and main sub-points with examples, facts, and statistics. Decide how well the speaker uses logic to build up his speech and to destroy what his opponents said.

C. EVIDENCE - Decide how well the speaker uses evidence by considering the following points: Is enough evidence used? Are the sources of the evidence stated? Are a variety of sources used? Are the sources competent? Does the evidence used directly support the point that is being made?

D. REFUTATION - Decide how skilled the speaker is in refutation by considering the following points: Is what is to be refuted stated clearly? Are the exact statements of the other team repeated? Does the refutation directly attack main contentions and main sub-points? Is the significance of the attack on the opponents' case pointed out?

E. DELIVERY - Decide how skilled the speaker is in delivery by considering the following points: Does the speaker speak distinctly and have a pleasant voice? Does the rate of speaking allow ease of comprehension? Does the speaker have direct eye contact with the audience? Does the speaker seem to be speaking extemporaneously or just reading note cards? Does the speaker appear poised and in control of the situation?

(Turn the page for the score sheet.)

TOTAL NEGATIVE TEAM SCORE

WINNER





## Ballot D

In my opinion the winner in this debate is  
the        affirmative        negative        team.        (Circle one.)

## APPENDIX C

Photograph of the Judging Groups

**APPENDIX C**

**Photograph of the Judging Groups**

Photograph of the judging groups taken the third round.



**Photograph of the judging groups taken the third round.**